DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 712 | 24 | SP 004 158

AUTHOR	Broadbent, William A.
TITLE	A Consideration of the Feasibility of Educational Objectives Commissions, Appendix D. Vol. II, A Plan for Managing the Development, Implementation and Operation of a Model Elementary Teacher Education Program.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Coll. of Education, Monmouth.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-0506
PUB DATE	Feb 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-9-470506-4039(010)
NOTE	23p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Supt. of Docs., Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (HE5.87: M72/V2, Appendixes A-P, $2.25)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
DESCRIPTORS	*Decision Making, Educational Objectives, Educational Planning, Educational Policy, Educational Problems, *Elementary School Teachers, Feasibility Studies, *Professional Associations, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Militancy, Unions
IDENTIFIERS	American Association of School Administrators, CETEM, *Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models, Educational Policy Commission, Eight-State Report, NEA

ABSTRACT

This report, considering the feasibility and effectiveness of educational objectives commissions, begins with a brief survey of the early history of such commissions, and then considers in more detail the work of commissions since 1935, when the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators established the Educational Policy Commission to study national pedagogical problems and to set educational objectives. This commission was dissolved in 1968, as it was felt to be insufficiently flexible to meet urgent problems. The work of the Eight-State Project, begun in 1965 to explore the possibility of designing education for the future, is examined, as well as the educational policy centers at Syracuse University and the Stanford Research Institute in California. The growth of teacher militancy in recent years is seen as producing a shift in the sources of educational decision-making to the teachers' unions and away from the educational objectives commissions. The historical record of the commissions, the research literature on their effectiveness, and the growth of teacher unionism seem to support a cynical assessment of the future prospects of the commissions. Related documents are SP 004 155 to SP 004 157 and SP004 159 to SP 004 166. (MBM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

APPENDIX D

A CONSIDERATION OF THE FEASIBILITY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES COMMISSIONS

William A. Broadbent
Teaching Research

ED042712
SP004158

An Overview of Relevant Theoretical Speculations from the Social Sciences

In the continuing inquiry into the process and prospects of goal-setting and public policy planning, two more or less distinct academic traditions have emerged. The first tradition has been championed by the economists. Academicians in this field have tended to look upon decision-making, having to do with setting social objectives and establishing policy, as essentially a rational process. They have sought to increase the public planner's ability to optimize his position. This approach to the problem of policy planning has tended to manifest itself in cost benefit and utility maximizing theory. The economist's approach to the problem is normative. Devotees of this school of thought are optimistic concerning the prospects in this area of human endeavor. The economists presume a high degree of rationality for the policy-planner, feel that he can project futurity with considerable accuracy, and believe that adequate information systems are either existent or can be developed to provide the planner with necessary data. The economists also presume that all participants in a system share the same fundamental social values and tend to perceive the system's overall goals in the same way.

The second academic tradition that has emerged in the study of goal-setting and public policy planning has been pioneered by the political science discipline. Foremost among the political scientists interested in the problems of setting objectives and decision-making have been March (1963) and Simons (1958). The latter scholar contends from his research that the decision-maker, in any given social system, tends to select those policy alternatives which are most "satisfycing" rather than those which are the most optimizing to the organization's end. Lindblom (1965), in his book Intelligence and Democracy, tends to agree and seems to suggest that public policy in a democracy is best characterized as "incremental planning" rather than as a highly systematic, rational process of goal-setting and alternative selection. The political scientists would contend from their research that the prospects for public policy planning, which would optimize the system's position, are bleak. In their view, this is so because those charged with policy formation lack the requisite rationality, ability to project futurities, and necessary information systems. They contend that the participants in the planning process often have different perceptions of the over-all objectives of the system of which they're a part and frequently have different personal values. The political science tradition is more descriptive and behaviorist in its orientation and, as perhaps a consequence, more cynical regarding prospects for the future.

Early History of Educational Policy Commissions

A review of the relevant historical literature reveals that most

written accounts, dealing with educational policy commissions,* concern only those bodies having nation-wide concerns. Perhaps the first evidence of an educational policy commission in American history can be found in the self-assumed responsibilities undertaken by the academic faculty at Yale in 1827. Disturbed by proposals for diversification of the traditional undergraduate curriculum, the Yale Faculty formed itself into an educational policy committee and prepared, what many felt, was the definitive, last word on higher education. In the Yale Report on the Classics, the faculty defended the educational orthodoxy of the period and called for the perpetuation of the traditional Latin-Greek curriculum without change. The report was premised on the assumed validity of a then contemporary science of the mind termed "phrenology" or "faculty psychology." The educational policy promulgated by the Yale Committee also assumed that knowledge was essentially noncumulative and that higher education was the exclusive preserve of gentlemen.

The first educational policy commission to address itself to the problem of prescribing objectives for secondary education was the famous Committee of Ten. This committee was created in 1893 to establish objectives and set policy guidelines for the then rapidly expanding secondary school system. Its chairman was Charles Eliot, who was at the time President of Harvard University. The membership of the committee was drawn primarily from the college and university community. Their recommendations became the most representative statement of the formal or classical school of pedagogical thought. The committee recommended that secondary school teachers have more extensive training in academic subject matter during their preservice education. They also recommended a four tract high school curriculum consisting of a program emphasizing classical studies, a program emphasizing Latin-Scientific studies, a program emphasizing Modern Language studies and a program emphasizing English studies. All curriculum options suggested were designed to prepare secondary school students for college entrance.

The Committee of Ten concluded that the function of education was to prepare students for adult life. In their view, academic training was the best kind of preparation for life. According to the committee, the function of the school was to improve the pupil's mind and develop heuristically within the student a sense of self-discipline. The Committee contended that a study of science and language would sharpen a student's powers of observation, a study of math would improve his facility for logical thought, and a study of history would improve his sense of judgment.

---

*Commissions established to set educational objectives have usually been called "educational policy commissions." While there is some semantic difference in the words "objectives" and "policy," the terms have tended to be used in a synonymous fashion with regards to the intended functions of such commissions or committees.

The first educational policy committee to address itself to the needs of elementary education was the Committee of Fifteen. The Committee of Fifteen was dominated by the personality of William Torrey Harris. At various times in his professional career, Harris had served as Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis, President of the National Educational Association, and United States Commissioner of Education.

The Committee of Fifteen was influenced in its policy deliberations by the activities of the Committee of Ten. The members of the committee, charged with establishing objectives for elementary education, assumed that the school was only one component of the educational process. In their view, the family played a central role in encouraging basic literacy and developing patterns of social and intellectual habit. The Committee of Fifteen reported that the primary purpose of elementary education was to train the student in basic academic techniques and skills. According to the Committee of Fifteen, the principal instructional tool should be the textbook which could give expression to the "theory of the race." The teacher's function was to assist the student in extracting information from assigned texts. In the Committee of Fifteen's view, the school should also, through example and inference, teach character and morality.

The pedagogical philosophy and policy of these early educational objectives committees was largely overturned by the pronouncements of a 1917 National Education Association Committee. This committee or commission was made up of public school principals, professors of education, YMCA representatives, and officials of the U. S. Office of Education. This committee's report, entitled Reorganization of Secondary Education, reflected a concern over the increasing social pluralism of American cities and the problems posed by the waves of immigration at the turn of the century. The educational objectives championed in the report came to be known as the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. The commission decided that the objectives of public education and the responsibilities of the school were and ought to be much more extensive than they had previously been construed. The committee members concluded that the schools had the responsibility for teaching: 1) good health; 2) command of fundamental processes; 3) worthy home membership; 4) vocations; 5) citizenship; 6) worthy use of leisure; and 7) ethical character. Due in part to the activities of this committee, the intellectual emphasis and academic objectives of the Committee of Ten were replaced in the minds of educators with a concern for teaching life processes and prescriptive policies stressing social education.

Recent History of Educational Policy Commissions

Both the National Education Association and its rival, the American Federation of Teachers, have experimented in the not too distant past with the use of policy commissions to establish educational objectives. The activities of the AFT have tended to be more sporadic in this area than its rival. In 1948 Kirkendall headed a commission which produced

a set of long-range objectives for American education in the post war period. These guidelines tended to be broad and ambiguous and were of such a nature that few could argue or disagree with them. For instance, the AFT objectives group asserted that American education ". . . must be democratic in its organization and its practices." A second major objective proposed by Kirkendall's commission was that ". . . schools and the community should develop an interactive relationship of mutual value." Such recommendations hardly represented unique insights or perceptive overviews.

In 1935 the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators established the Educational Policy Commission to study national pedagogical problems and to set educational objectives. The EPC in its heyday was composed of 20 distinguished, elder statemen of education. At its demise, the commission had been reduced to 16 members. The commissioners had a research staff at their disposal and frequently issued reports and educational pronouncements on various education-related subjects.

J. E. Russell, one of the last members of the EPC, defended the commission in an article in the CTA Journal in 1960. Answering the criticisms of those who claimed that the commission was too far removed from reality and constituted an unnecessary expense, Russell declared that the commission's composition and organization represented the very essence of national pedagogical wisdom and was necessary for the rational evolution of educational policy. Russell claimed that for an educational policy commission to be successful: 1) the pace of deliberations must necessarily be slow; 2) the commission must have an adequate professional staff; 3) the members must have had extensive experience in the field; and 4) the members must be prestigious persons. Reflecting on the fourth prerequisite, it is evident that Russell did not suffer from a lack of personal self-esteem.

Throughout its 33 years, the Educational Policies Commission tended to mirror the societal concerns of the day and reflected the swings of pedagogical thought. Its publications of the thirties reflected a concern for "life adjustment learning" and "education for citizenship." In Education in American Democracy (1937), The Education of Free Men in American Democracy (1941), and The Purposes of Education in American Democracy (1938), these themes were prevalent. In the 1938 report, the commission exhorted the schools to ". . . define the underlying values inherent in the universally accepted goal of worthy home membership." The commission called for greater attention to the emotional aspects of children's development and urged school men to fill the gaps in their own "social education." However, in the post sputnik era, the commission reversed itself and insisted that the school return to an emphasis on academic subjects and a training of the intellect.

In its final years the EPC membership was composed of, what many would term, "establishment" personalities. Positions on the commission were held by such prestigious persons in the educational universe as CTA Executive Secretary, Arthur Corey; Indiana University President,

Herman B. Well; and St. Louis Superintendent of Instruction, Philip V. Hickey. Throughout its brief history, the commission's frequent reports and statements of position tended to be vague, ambiguous and honorific. Its policies were bland exhortations to the educational community at large to do good.

In 1968 the executive bodies of the NEA and AASA voted to dissolve the EPC as an autonomous deliberative agency. NEA President, Braulio Alonso, praised the commission for ". . . having made a unique contribution to public thinking in education over the years." However, Alonso noted that the EPC was not sufficiently flexible to meet urgent problems. He claimed that the contemporary trend was to utilize short term ad hoc committees that had the advantage of mobilizing appropriate talent and knowledge for the solution of immediate, specific problems. According to AASA President, William H. Curtis, there were many other agencies than available within the professional organizations, in the foundations, the government and universities which were also engaged in the kinds of long-range analysis and mobilization of public opinion which used to be the unique preserve of the EPC.

In 1957, Herbert M. Hamlin published a booklet of the how-to-do-it variety on the subject of establishing citizen advisory groups for local policy-making in public education. The booklet, entitled "Citizen Participation in Local Policy Making for Public Education," was printed by the Office of Field Services of the College of Education at the University of Illinois. In the booklet's forward, M. R. Sumption, Head of the Office of Field Services, argued that professional educators should supply ideas regarding organizational patterns, procedures, and methods by which intelligent, constructive citizen participation in educational policy making could be realized. The booklet provided guidelines for implementing citizen advisory commissions based upon the author's "years of experience in the field." The author argued that such citizen advisory educational policy commissions were needed to fill the vacuum left by ineffectual local school boards. The author failed to acknowledge research which suggests that local boards of education are in fact highly constrained and restricted by state law, state boards of education, and inadequate financial resource bases. However, the booklet did include a bibliography of like-minded publications published during the fifties which has been incorporated into the reference list of this document.

In 1964, James B. Conant published yet another episode in his rather relentless critique of American education. In a small volume entitled, Shaping Educational Policy, Conant found fault with the organization of and policy setting process in American education. Conant claimed that the national concern for education and the revolution in techniques had together made obsolete our past method of determining educational policy in the United States. The author charged that any amorphous, unofficial body composed of public school administrators and professors of education was not well suited to establish policy for the public schools. In Conant's view, what was needed was to dis-

credit the accrediting agencies, increase the effectiveness of state educational authorities and have the states bring about an integration of the views of the state teacher associations, the professors of education, the academic profession, and the laymen. In Conant's opinion, the state boards of education should be composed of laymen and should have the power to appoint and remove the chief state school officer. Conant claimed that the major weakness of state departments of education was that they were too much a part of the "educational establishment."

According to the American Council of Education's President, Allan M. Carter, Conant's book provided the inspiration behind the idea for an Educational Commission of the States. Governor Terry Sanford, working in conjunction with the American Council of Education and with financial assistance from the Carnagie Foundation crystallized the idea for the Compact and the Interstate Commission.

Throughout the period of its inception, many persons expressed misgivings regarding the efficacy of such a commission. The NEA's John Dale Russell expressed concern over the kind of policy such a commission could make. According to Russell, educational policy always implies fiscal policy. It takes financial resources to implement any program or idea. Perhaps reflecting on the experience of the deceased EPC, Russell questioned the value of pronouncements or statements of goals made by an organization which lacked resources for implementation and techniques for sanctioning recalcitrant constituents.

Paul Miller also questioned the value of such commissions. He claimed there was already a plethora of groups that, as part of their perceived responsibilities prescribed the future direction of public educational policy. Other members of the educational community criticized the proposed commission for involving educational and political leadership the same policy-oriented organization. And, finally, many state university spokesmen expressed concern about Article IV, Section 5 of the Compact's constitution which delegated the Commission the power to:

> Formulate suggested policies and plans for the improvement of public education as a whole, or for any segment thereof and make recommendations with respect thereto available to the appropriate governmental units, agencies and public officials.

University spokesmen saw this section as granting the commission the right to exercise discretionary authority which had been traditionally reserved for the university community itself.

The Compact was designed to go into effect when as many as 10 state governments had expressed a willingness to cooperate. The Compact allows each participating state to have seven representatives on the policy commission. These are to include the governor, a member of the

legislative branch for each house, the state's chief school officer, and 3 other representatives from the community at large. The specific purposes of the commission are explained in the Compact's First Article and are summarized below. The Commission of the States is designed to:

1. Establish and maintain close cooperation among the various branches of government with regard to education;

2. Provide a forum for discussion, development, crystallization and recommendation of public policy alternatives in education;

3. Provide a clearing house for information; and

4. Facilitate the improvement of individual state programs.

However, the commission is significantly limited in its ability to initiate innovation and change by Section C of Article VII. This section states that the commission may not pledge the credit of any state in any manner. At the present time 42 states have indicated a willingness to cooperate in the experiment. The commission is at present involved in an assessment of natural educational needs.

It is far too early to draw any conclusions regarding the effectiveness of this new national policy commission. While its presumed scope of activity is national in scale, its basic responsibilities are analogous to those of many proposed local and regional educational policy commissions. The evolution of the Commission of the States should be watched with care by all those interested in drawing lessons from its experience and sharing in its research and other professional products.

Recent Research and Other Professional Activities in the Area of Educational Objectives Setting, Policy-Planning, and Futurities Projection

In 1965, eight state departments of education proposed the creation of a study group to explore the possibility of "Designing Education for the Future." The United States Office of Education offered to underwrite the project which came to be known as the Eight-State Project.

The chief state school officers of the eight cooperating states were designated as the policy board for the project. The board itself selected a research staff consisting of a project director and associate director. In addition, the policy board approved a project budget derived from funds obtained under Title V Section 505 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1955, and adopted policy guidelines to direct the research staff in conducting the project. Each state subsequently selected a state coordinator to be responsible to the state's chief school officer for planning and directing studies and activities

relating to the various projects to be conducted in the state.

The project was to theoretically involve two distinct but related types of activities. The first area of endeavor was the development of regional conferences by the project staff. These conferences were to facilitate the exchange and dissemination of ideas about educational futures by knowledgeable persons. They were to be conducted primarily for the benefit of the participating states and their constituent populations. The second area of proposed endeavor was the implementation of plans for studies for the improvement of education within each state. The latter activity became largely a dead letter with regards to the project as the individual states were charged with these responsibilities. As a result, the project outcomes have largely consisted of regional symposiums at which papers directed at speculations regarding the future are read. These papers or essays, in turn, are edited and published by the project staff in series.

The project staff located itself at Denver, Colorado and set about publishing these series of anthologies of solicited articles pertaining to the future and prospects for education.

The first volume of the series was subtitled Prospective Changes in Society by 1980 and was edited by educationalists emeritus Edgar Morphet and Charles O. Ryan. This first volume included a collection of 16 essays by 21 knowledgeables from a broad range of backgrounds. The authors qualified their efforts by suggesting that they were based on the "best evidence available," though the best evidence available usually consisted of general information having broad circulation. The essays for the most part proved to be overviews and projections of recent historical trends. In general, the contributors saw the future as being more complex and confusing but predicted that, as a whole, present trends would persist.

The second volume in the series was subtitled Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society. It resulted from a series of papers delivered at the Second Conference held in Salt Lake City between October 24-26, 1966. Fourteen papers and four supplementary statements appeared in the report.

At the outset of the report the editors cautioned: ". . . almost everyone knows that changes must be made in education for many reasons, but there is so little agreement on many concepts and proposals that limited, if any, progress can be made . . ." Unfortunately the second volume of the series did little to provide a systematic approach for referencing educational needs in terms of the future.

The third volume produced by the project was entitled Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education. This compilation included papers by other experts who were assigned the task of exploring strategies and procedures for implementing changes yet unspecified in the project in individual schools, school systems, and state educational agencies.

These papers were initially delivered at a conference held in Scottsdale, Arizona on April 3-5, 1967. The Chairman of the Policy Board duly noted at this juncture that: "This project continues to be one of the most exciting and significant projects of our time." Among the more interesting of the essays were those discussing the political considerations inherent in educational policy change. Ralph Kimbrough repeated his often asserted notion that schools are political enterprises. He further reiterated a slightly modified varient of his review of community power research. However, Nicholas Masters, a professor of political science, did offer an interesting view regarding the relationship between educational appropriation and political power. In Master's view, educators must decide whether they are going to have institutional autonomy or institutionalized planning for the purposes of executing specific programs. The author maintained that educators characteristically seek both objectives although research evidence suggests such objectives are largely incompatible in the real world.

Master's article drew attention to a fundamental problem characteristic of most research activity in the area of projecting educational futurities. Educators, when speculating about the future, tend to be normatively oriented in their projections. They have not as yet developed a viable approach for obtaining insights into the future. As a result, they tend to forecast and anticipate the future in terms of existing trends and patterns of behavior.

The fourth volume, published by the Eight State Project study group during the first year of operations consisted of a synthesis and supplement of the three previous conference reports. The publication, subtitled Cooperative Planning for Education in 1980, concentrated on the most important of the perceived future educational needs of society and offered suggestions of a general nature with respect to how such changes might be effected. The most valuable of these contributions involved a discussion of future educational financing and changing patterns of power in educational governance.

Four additional volumes reflecting yet another year of project activities have also been published. These volumes do not vary significantly in quality or approach from the previous year's products. The Eight State Project Study, like so many other policy-oriented study groups established to project educational futurities and suggest new policy, falls somewhat short of realizing its stated goal. The end product of the Eight State Project to date is a series of pleasant essays having little research basis that provides information and considered speculation previously available.

In the last seven years there have been three major research proposals funded by the federal government which have sought to study the problems and prospects of systematic, policy-planning in education.

Leward A. Lecht successfully submitted a proposal to the U. S.

Office of Education which has relevance for those interested in educational objectives and policy formation. Lecht proposed a pilot study of the consequences of anticipated social and economic changes during the next 20 years, for decision-making in education. Part I of the research product is to consist of a model for an operational, educational-policy research center. Lecht is interested in the inherent problems of any such organizational concept and is particularly concerned with informational flow of the projected center. This scholar's research was to begin in June of 1967 and to be completed by February of 1968. Unfortunately, the study has not been reported in its entirety as yet.

Another research project which at its inception gave promise of providing data and findings that would be relevant for those interested in educational policy planning, was initiated at the Hudson Institute in Groton, Connecticut. The proposal, as originally submitted to the U. S. Office of Education by Herman Kahn, envisioned a study of the feasibility of developing a national educational policy research system. A group of interrelated studies was to be conducted to provide guidance in the establishment of operational centers for research on future educational needs, resources, and policies. According to the initiator, the studies were to involve actual looks into the future which could identify and describe alternative trends for both education and for facets of society and technology impinging upon and relating to educational policy. In Kahn's proposal, a set of alternative, basic, educational strategies were to be developed for educational policy which would provide a comparative look at a reasonably complete range of assumptions and objectives. And finally, organizational and methodological recommendations of a preliminary nature were to have been made for setting up a prototype, educational-policy research system.

Unfortunately, when the final report was issued, the grand conception envisioned in the initial proposal had been scaled down and there were evidences of coordination problems among research staff members. The research was now described as a group of ancillary pilot studies.

Part 1 of the final report describes briefly some of the methodological and substantive issues that occurred during the project and suggests how portions of the work originally envisioned might be continued through to fruition. Parts 2-9 of the report consist of individually authored papers which are marginally related to each other and only remotely related to the original proposal.

The most valuable of all recent federally funded research relating to the problem of educational objectives planning is that initiated by Marvin Adelson of the System Development Corporation of Santa Monica, California. His research is entitled "A Pilot Center for Educational Policy Research." Some of his activities and findings have implications for those charged with setting up commissions for educational objectives formation. The research included studies of contextual mapping, mathematical models, and semi-automatic data bases. The findings which are

germane for our particular interest, however, involve this research group's studies of educational "wants" and the use of advisory groups as a resource to policy formation.

In studying educational "wants" the researchers sought to:

1. Experiment with methods for ascertaining group educational "wants";

2. Determine what selected groups within the United States wanted from future educational programs;

3. Examine the extent to which the several groups studied agreed or disagreed with respect to what they wanted; and

4. Identify potential issues raised by the impacts of these "wants" upon current trends in education.

Four sessions with different groups were held. The groups included educators, black community representatives, training professionals, and writers. Three sessions were conducted in California and one in New York. The third meeting, that with the training professionals and futurists, was conducted utilizing the restraints of the Delphi technique. The first two and last meetings were loosely structured. The research findings were as follows:

1. When talking about longer-range futures, most attendees at the sessions were unable to project futurities with any degree of imagination or insight. The effective range of the participant speculators was about five years.

2. Verbally describing a hypothetical longer-range future, failed to increase the attendees' ability to project futures.

3. Unstructured discussions about incipient educational needs tended to drift towards present problems and proposals for immediate solutions.

4. Although bringing together people who represented different groups and factors in the population tended to expose their differences of opinion and therefore raise issues, it did not fully expose <u>group</u> attitudes or shared points of view. In discussions conducted with heterogeneous groups, the firmness with which a position was expressed tended to be proportional to the personal forcefulness and persuasiveness of the individual spokesman rather than to the strength of the conviction of the constituency he represented.

5. All participants agreed (or at least did not disagree) that one of their primary wants is for truly individualized education.

6. Most attendees could name the characteristics of the present educational system that they did not like or want perpetuated in the future. However, not one person could present a coherent description of a future educational system along with the characteristics it should have. There were no systematically formulated clusters of wants from which one could project one or more "ideal" concepts of an educational system in the future.

7. There was a general awareness evidenced of the inherent conflict between the need to educate each individual as a whole, self-fulfilling person and the need to educate him as a member of a highly organized technological society.

The findings of Adelson and his colleagues regarding the limitations of community advisory groups in conceptualizing long-range futures, predicting educational needs, and identifying and measuring group conflict among a pluralistic population should be considered in the design of any educational objectives commission.

Educational Policy Centers

Recently the federal government decided to underwrite the speculative endeavors of two proposed Educational Policy Centers. The two centers selected for financial assistance were those at Syracuse University and the research center sponsored by Stanford Research Institute at Menlo Park, California. As both research centers are still quite new, little in the way of a developmental product has been forthcoming.

Thomas F. Green, writing in the Journal of Research and Development in Education's Summer issue of 1969, reported upon the progress of the Educational Policy Research Center at Syracuse. In that article Professor Green argued that the purpose of the Educational Policy Center at Syracuse could be formulated in a single sentence. In his view, the purpose ". . . is to develop a capability for thinking about the future in such a way as to permit the assessment of educational policies within the context of conjectures about alternative long-range futures." Professor Green reported that those charged with project responsibilities were at present involved in developing the capabilities to fulfill this purpose. He argued that one of the primary concerns of the Syracuse project was the assessment of policy. Green contended that those associated with the Syracuse program do not intend to recommend policies but will seek to make the consequences of policy planners choices explicit. In this way it will make it easier for those charged with decision-making responsibilities in education to weigh alternative consequences in making choices. Green reported that there were three basic techniques being employed at the Syracuse site to study futures. The first is the Delphi Technique, the second

is something Green called "Cross-Impact Matrices," and the third involves simulation gaming.

Green argued that at this early date it was impossible to present a detailed description of activities underway. However, he reported that there are some activities within the center which will produce early results. These activities have to do with policy issues facing the Federal Government with regards to post-secondary education. As the center moved into its second year of existence, Green promised that the Syracuse project would make an exciting contribution to the study of educational futures.

Recently Willis W. Harman, Director of the Educational Policy Research Center at the Stanford Research Institute, delivered a paper at a conference of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration regarding the current progress of his project.* Harman suggested that there are three basic methods that have been utilized in the past to project future histories. The first is that which involves the study of events. In such an approach such things as wars and famines are anticipated on the basis of their occurrences in the past. The second basic method that has been utilized to project historical futures is that having to do with the utilization of social descriptors. In other words, by using social descriptors, one studies trends of such things as crime rates and then projects such trends into the future. The third basic approach that has been used is that which emphasizes the study of belief and value systems. In this approach, those concerned with projecting future histories seek to examine evolving social values and societal concerns and project the impacts of these attitudes and beliefs upon the future organization of society. According to Harman, the third is the most valid of approaches. The speculations that have taken place in Menlo Park have been couched in this tradition.

Harman contended that such speculations should take place within the context of six world macro problems that are anticipated to be operative between 1970 and 1990. These, in order of their primacy are population, biosphere, poverty, bioengineering, weapons, and individual rights.

By the year 1990 the population of the world will have greatly increased. This will greatly aggravate the associated problems of political and economic stability and will result inevitably in the starvation of large numbers of people. The second macro problem involves a factor Harman called a biosphere or the relationship between man and his environment. The Stanford Research Institute has suggested that by the year 1990 the already overwhelming problems of pollution will have become critical. The third area of concern involves poverty. According to Harman, factors operating in the international economy will tend to aggravate the growing gap between the rich and the very poor. The fourth problem described involves bioengineering. Bioengineering refers

---

*This conference was held on October 8 and 9 in Portland, Oregon.

to the increasing ability of man to affect future generations by manipulating the genetic makeup of such individuals. Such a potential will produce tremendous ethical and operational problems. A fifth problem is described as weapons. Increasing complexity and costs of defense systems will generate tremendous social tensions in the not too distant future. The sixth problem is that concerning the matter of individual rights. Harman contended that the growing needs of society will increasingly come into conflict with the prerogatives of individuals.

The Stanford Research Institute as an Educational Policy Center has developed an analytical framework for studying or projecting future trends. This involves three basic components. The first is the study of "need," the second involves "force," and the third concerns something described as rationale. Using this analytical schema as a frame of reference, Professor Harman suggested that there are three basic prototypes of the future which will be possible by 1990. Two of these are, in Harman's view, related. His policy center has suggested that by 1990 American and world society may be characterized by a highly technical and bureaucratically oriented culture. In other words, Harman sees a possible acceleration of present technological trends. Basically, a second industrial revolution is contemplated where work, which was formally a function of man's mind, will increasingly be relegated to machines and computers. The results of this tendency towards a technologically oriented society will be a more impersonal, dehumanized culture where the quality of life is less rich than that of the present day. A second possible future history, according to Harman, involves a possible major reaction against the present youth movement. This would result in a garrison state in which the forces of law and order, technologically reinforced, sought to suppress the values and influence of those holding values similar to those of the present youth movement.

The third possibility would be a personalized society. Such a society would represent a logical extension of the kinds of concerns that the contemporary youth movement throughout the world is interested in. The resulting culture would reflect values markedly different than those prevalent today. Such a change of cultural emphasis in Harman's view would represent as fundamental a revolution as that of the Protestant Reformation.

The development of either one of these three prototypes would have tremendous implications for the nature of schools in 1990 and the general context of education.

In essence, however, there is a case which can be made for the position that there is very little new or novel in Stanford Research Institute's present thesis regarding future cultures. Essentially, what Harman and his associates have done is to suggest that two basic cultural alternatives are available to man. By grouping the garrison state alternative with that of the accentuated technological culture alterna-

tive and contrasting them with the humanist or personalized culture alternative, a dichotomy of cultural values is achieved. The efficacy of these alternative sets of cultural values has been a concern of those interested in speculating about the "good society" since the beginning of Western civilization. In essence, this concern over the direction of what a future society should take and whether it will reflect the reductionist or the humanist view of man was the basis of the dialogue between Plato and Isocrates. More recently this conflict between alternative value systems and its impact on the future has been the subject of C. P. Snow's small volume entitled Two Cultures. C. P. Snow maintains that we already have clear delineation between two alternative future states: the humanist versus the rationalist versions. Snow argues normatively for some kind of viable synthesis. The Educational Policies Commission Center at Stanford has produced a developmental product which suggests that the conflict between the reductionists and humanists will continue to be a factor in explaining the nature of future histories.

Teacher Unionism

Richard C. Williams, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs of the Graduate School of Education at U.C.L.A. also delivered a paper at the C.A.S.E.A. conference of October 8 and 9. This paper also has some relevance for those concerned about projecting educational futures. Williams suggested that all rationalistic attempts to project the future in such a way as to more adequately maximize the returns of education for society may be doomed to failure. In Williams' view, this is due to the fact that teachers are progressively taking over responsibility for guiding the direction of education themselves. According to Williams, teachers may obtain a monopoly in such decision making. He contends that the trend is a direct correlate of increasing teacher militancy. Williams claimed that the American Federation of Teachers has accomplished something on the scale of a minor miracle in the last fifteen years in galvanizing teachers into a political and economic force. He maintained that the AFT has been most successful in obtaining influence for teachers in such things as educational decision making.

Citing 114 strikes held during the academic year 1967-1968, Williams contended that eight percent (80%) of all the lost teaching time between 1950 and 1968 was lost during that academic year. Recent strikes and collective bargaining legislation according to Williams are dramatic indices of increasing teacher power.

Williams contended that there are three basic factors underlying this increasing teacher power. He suggested that teachers have an enormous potential for influence and can effectively confront the political system governing education. One of the bases of this power is the inelastic demand for teacher labor. It is impossible to effectively replace a striking teacher. It requires a minimum of four years

and in some states five years to train a teacher. As schools cannot be closed for long periods of time without social and economic disruption, and as adequate substitutes for striking teachers cannot be found, it is usually necessary for the community to accede to the demands of striking teachers. A second factor explaining the recent rise in teacher power and effectiveness is the increasing awareness among teachers of their historical lack of effectiveness. Teachers are increasingly aware that through inadequate salaries and other financial compensations they have been subsidizing about 1/8 of the total cost of American education. The third factor explaining recent gains in teacher power is their willingness to stand together in tension-fraught situations. According to Williams, when teachers are willing to stand the heat and tensions of social confrontations, statutes prohibiting strikes are ineffective.

Williams argued that there are two basic environmental factors which have encouraged teacher militancy. One of these he describes as being external. He said that in recent years teachers have been operating in an atmosphere pervaded by civil disobedience and militant union activities. A further external environmental consideration facilitating such developments is the general societal dissatisfaction with schools. The second major factor is internal. Williams claimed that conditions within the schools and in the teaching profession are rapidly changing. There are more men than ever in the profession and as a result there is a lower turnover of teachers. There is also a greater increase in the academic preparation and skill levels of teachers than in the past. In 1968 only 4 percent of all teachers in the United States did not have a bachelors degree. As a result, teachers feel more prepared, more efficacious and more deserving of greater compensation and a larger role in educational decision-making.

Citing Corwin's work, Williams also contended that the generation gap is greater in education than in any other social subsystem.

Williams suggested that teacher militancy will manifest itself in the evolution of one of two basic modes of educational decision-making in most areas of the United States. The two models that he sees as being most likely to be successful are the "academic" or collegial model, and the union model. Williams suggested that in all probability the union model will prevail in most areas. As a result, teachers, through collective bargaining, will negotiate contracts that will concern themselves with such things as defining curriculum, the purposes of the school, and the function of teachers within the school. All of these are areas in which one would think that an educational policy commission might normally concern itself. However, given the ferment in the profession and the apparent impending victory of teacher unionism, the potential for decision-making of an educational objectives commission may have been usurped.

Conclusion

The historical record of educational policy commissions, the research literature regarding the effectiveness of such groups, and the prospect of teacher unionism seems to lend support to the political scientists' more cynical position regarding the prospects for rational objectives' setting by educational objectives commissions.

Bibliography

Adelsen, Marvin et. al. A Pilot Center for Educational Policy Research. Final Report, Part I. Santa Monica: Systems Development Corp., 1968. (mimeographed)

Ancillary Pilot Study for the Educational Policy Research Center Program. Final Report. Groton: Hudson Institute, 1969. (mimeographed)

American Association of School Administrators. National Educational Assessments: Pro and Con. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.

American Association of School Administrators. Policies for Education in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, 1946.

"Audited Financial Statements and Other Financial Information," Agana: Government of Guam, (June, 1962).

Bell, Daniel (Chairman), "Toward the Year 2000: work in progress." Daedalus, Vol. 96, No. 3 (Summer 1967). The complete issue: pp. 639-988.

Bentwell, W. D. "Death of the E.P.C." PTA Magazine. 62: 26 (February 17, 1968).

Brownlee, Haydon. The Year 2000. Santa Monica: The RAND Corporation, 1967.

Cartter, Allan M. "The Shaping of the Compact for Education,: Educational Record. 47: 81-98 (Winter, 1966).

"Compact for Education," Educational Record. 47: 116-121, (Winter, 1966).

Conant, J. B. "Inept Lesson in Educational Policy-making." Pennsylvania School Journal, 113: 407-408 (May, 1965).

Crain, Robert L. Educational Decision Making and the Distribution of Influence in Cities. Unpublished paper presented to an APSA meeting, September, 1966 (mimeographed)

Dahl, Robert G. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Dreiman, David B. How to Get Better Schools. Harper and Bros., New York: 1956. 267 p.

Eastmond, Jefferson N. "Developing an Operational Philosophy of Education," Salt Lake City: World-Wide Education and Research Institute, (April, 1969) (mimeographed).

"Educational Policies Commission," Minnesota Journal of Education. 43: 26 (February, 1963).

"Educational Policies Commission to Cease Operations," School and Society. 96: 231-232 (April 13, 1968).

"Educational Policies Commission Urges Schools to Concentrate on the Central Purpose of Education." Art Education. 14: 18 (November, 1961).

"EPC Dies Age 33." Phi Delta Kappan, 49: 245 (January, 1968).

"EPC Makes Plea for General Assistance." Pennsylvania Journal. 116: 94 (October, 1967).

Gallagher, John F. Decision Making in Public Education: Views from the Professional Literature. Institute of Governmental Affairs, Occasional Paper No. 5 Davis, California: University of California, 1965.

Gans, Herbert The Urban Villages: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Gabor, D. Inventing the Future. New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1964.

Goodenough, Ward Hunt. Cooperation in Change. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1963.

Green, Thomas F. "The Educational Research Center at Syracuse: Problems and Prospects," Journal of Research and Development in Education. Vol. 2: No. 4 (Summer, 1969). pp.49-66.

"Guam: Its Economy and Selected Development Opportunities," Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute, 1959.

Hamlin, Herbert M. Citizens Committees in the Public Schools. The Interstate, Danville, Ill. 1952.

Hamlin, Herbert M. The Public and its Education. The Interstate, Danville, Illinois. 1955.

Harman, Willis W. "Contemporary Social Forces and Alternative Futures," Journal of Research and Development in Education. Vol. 2: No. 4. (Summer, 1969) pp. 67-90.

Hechinger, Fred M. An Adventure in Education. Macmillan Co., New York: 1956. 266 p.

Hunter, Floyd. The Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Illinois Citizens Report. Illinois Pre-White-House Conference on Education, 1955. Office of the State Superintendent on Public Instruction, Springfield.

Illinois Publications on the Schools and Education Useful to Citizens. Illinois Citizens Education Committee, 103 Gregory Hall, Urbana, Illinois. 1957. (mimeographed).

Key, V. O. Southern Politics in State and Nation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.

Kindred, Leslie W. "Citizen Advisory Committees," Chapter 11, School Public Relations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Kirkendall, Lester A. et. al. Goals for American Education. Chicago: Commission on Educational Reconstruction, American Federation of Teachers, 1948.

Lasswell, Thomas E. Class and Stratum Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Leone, Joe. "A Study of the Standardized Testing Program as it Relates to Educational Program Evaluation in the School Systems of Guam," Agana: Government of Guam, circa 1968.

McKee, Elmore M. "What Price Schools?" Chapter 9, The People Act. Harper and Bros., New York. 1955.

March, James G. and Herbert Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.

Mead, Margaret. "The Future as the Basis for Establishing a Shared Culture." Daedalus, Vol. 94, No. 1, (Winter, 1965) pp. 135-55.

Morphet, Edgar L. and Ryan, Charles O. (Eds.) Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education. Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project, 1967.

Muller-Thym, B. J. "Cultural and Social Changes," The Changing American Population, Hoke S. Simpson, editor. Report of the Arden House Conference. New York: Institute of Life Insurance, 1962.

National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators, Written Policies for School Boards.

Parsons, Talcot. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.

Parsons, Talcot. et. al. (Eds.) Theories of Society. Vol. 1, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Russel, J. E. "What Does an Educational Policies Commission Do? California Teachers Association Journal. 56: 12-13, (April, 1960).

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior: A Strain of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization, New York: Macmillan Company, 1958.

"Statements of Regret on the Passing of the EPC." Michigan Education Journal, 45: 2 (February, 1968).

Stauffer, Harold. How to Work with Citizen Advisory Committees for Better Schools. Metropolitan School Study Council, 525 W. 120th St., New York: 27. 1957.

Steward, Julian H. Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Stoddard, Alexander J. Schools of Tomorrow: An Educator's Blueprint. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.

Sumption, Merle R. How to Conduct a Citizens School Survey. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York: 1952. 209 p.

Sumption, Merle R. and Landes, Jack L. "Community Participation," Chapter 3, Planning Functional School Buildings. Harper and Bros., New York, 1957.

The Committee for the White House Conference on Education. Full Report. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1956. 126 p.

Tinbergen, J. "Educational Assessment," Economic and Social Aspects of Educational Planning. New York: UNESCO, 1964. pp. 165-205.